

Proposed plan leaves rural West Virginia behind

Editor:

I am concerned about a proposal for the Universal Service Fund under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit high-speed wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology.

Under the proposal, rural West Virginia could lose out on up to \$70 million that would be used for new mobile wireless broadband sites and infrastructure over the next 10 years. Denying the choice of wireless broadband access at a time when people rely on mobile devices more than ever is shortsighted and could prove dangerous to our rural communities.

Every time a new wireless broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened, allowing our emergency responders to locate victims quicker and more efficiently. The difference between a reliable wireless network and a spotty one can literally mean the difference between life and death.

Randolph County has seen the benefits of Universal Service in the past. In 2009, the federal funds were used by U.S. Cellular to build two cell sites that have since been outfitted with 3G mobile broadband - one in Beverly and one near Kerens. But the job to bring reliable wireless networks to our rural communities is not finished. In fact, if the FCC approves this proposal, a future cell site expected to be built in Montrose could be in jeopardy.

That is why I am urging everyone to visit www.wirelessbroadbandforall.com and let Congress know that high-speed wireless broadband is wanted and needed in Randolph County as much as anywhere else. We simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sheriff Jack Roy Jr.
Randolph County Sheriff's Department

Scott Hunter
1530 Saxman Avenue
Morgantown, WV 26505-5326

October 18, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned that an upcoming decision by the FCC to reform the Universal Service Fund to provide improved access to broadband in rural America may not do enough to promote the deployment of mobile wireless broadband Internet. All Americans need dependable access to broadband, both wired and wireless, to compete in this fast-changing world. But we need to make sure this reform is done right. There needs to be a fair share of funding allocated for mobile broadband expansion.

A recent CTIA study found that mobile broadband expansion can work successfully with an investment of \$1 billion per year - that's less than one-quarter of the total Connect America Fund. Yet, I understand there are proposals under consideration that would seriously underfund mobile broadband deployment with up to 93 percent of available funds being directed to wireline broadband.

Not only does wireless broadband create thousands of jobs in rural America, it also ensures that people living in these areas enjoy the same level of "on-the-go" connectivity as their urban counterparts. From coal-miners, to oil and gas well operators, to farmers, wireless data access is crucial to the success of these industries. Wired connectivity is not an option for them.

Inadequate investment in mobile broadband will cost our nation jobs and also compromise the ability of first responders and law enforcement to act quickly when timing is critical. If the Connect America Fund does not appropriately account for wireless, the safety and prosperity of our rural citizens will be diminished.

Rural citizens pay into the Universal Service Fund and deserve to see the benefits of mobile broadband investment. Utilizing \$1 billion out of a \$4.5 billion fund for wireless broadband is not too much to ask.

I urge you to ensure that reform of the Universal Service Fund includes a fair share for mobile wireless broadband networks. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Scott D. Hunter
304-296-8585

Amber Gibson
51 Howe Street
Elkins, WV 26241-3750

October 18, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned that an upcoming decision by the FCC to reform the Universal Service Fund to provide improved access to broadband in rural America may not do enough to promote the deployment of mobile wireless broadband Internet. All Americans need dependable access to broadband, both wired and wireless, to compete in this fast-changing world. But we need to make sure this reform is done right. There needs to be a fair share of funding allocated for mobile broadband expansion.

A recent CTIA study found that mobile broadband expansion can work successfully with an investment of \$1 billion per year - that's less than one-quarter of the total Connect America Fund. Yet, I understand there are proposals under consideration that would seriously underfund mobile broadband deployment with up to 93 percent of available funds being directed to wireline broadband.

Right now, mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. First responders and law enforcement depend on wireless networks to quickly pinpoint the location of a victim or a crime; farmers use mobile broadband to track shipments and complete transactions without having to leave the fields; and businesses use it to stay connected to employees and customers.

Furthermore, the economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invest \$1 billion per year in mobile broadband over the next 10 years, 150,000 new American jobs could be created.

Inadequate investment in mobile broadband will cost our nation jobs and compromise the ability of first responders and law enforcement to act quickly when timing is critical. If the Connect America Fund does not appropriately account for wireless, the safety and prosperity of our rural citizens will be diminished.

Rural citizens pay into the Universal Service Fund and deserve to see the benefits of mobile broadband investment. Utilizing \$1 billion out of a \$4.5 billion fund for wireless broadband is not too much to ask.

I urge you to ensure that reform of the Universal Service Fund includes a fair share for mobile wireless broadband networks. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Amber Gibson
304-621-2765

Cassandra Carper
22A Mountain Ave
White Sulphur Springs, WV 24986-2546

October 17, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned that an upcoming decision by the FCC to reform the Universal Service Fund to provide improved access to broadband in rural America may not do enough to promote the deployment of mobile wireless broadband Internet. All Americans need dependable access to broadband, both wired and wireless, to compete in this fast-changing world. But we need to make sure this reform is done right. There needs to be a fair share of funding allocated for mobile broadband expansion.

A recent CTIA study found that mobile broadband expansion can work successfully with an investment of \$1 billion per year - that's less than one-quarter of the total Connect America Fund. Yet, I understand there are proposals under consideration that would seriously underfund mobile broadband deployment with up to 93 percent of available funds being directed to wireline broadband.

Right now, mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. First responders and law enforcement depend on wireless networks to quickly pinpoint the location of a victim or a crime; farmers use mobile broadband to track shipments and complete transactions without having to leave the fields; and businesses use it to stay connected to employees and customers.

Furthermore, the economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invest \$1 billion per year in mobile broadband over the next 10 years, 150,000 new American jobs could be created.

Inadequate investment in mobile broadband will cost our nation jobs and compromise the ability of first responders and law enforcement to act quickly when timing is critical. If the Connect America Fund does not appropriately account for wireless, the safety and prosperity of our rural citizens will be diminished.

Rural citizens pay into the Universal Service Fund and deserve to see the benefits of mobile broadband investment. Utilizing \$1 billion out of a \$4.5 billion fund for wireless broadband is not too much to ask.

I urge you to ensure that reform of the Universal Service Fund includes a fair share for mobile wireless broadband networks. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Cassandra Carper
3045208782

Dee Taylor
1242 kings rd
Morgantown, WV 26508-9155

October 17, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned that an upcoming decision by the FCC to reform the Universal Service Fund to provide improved access to broadband in rural America may not do enough to promote the deployment of mobile wireless broadband Internet. All Americans need dependable access to broadband, both wired and wireless, to compete in this fast-changing world. But we need to make sure this reform is done right. There needs to be a fair share of funding allocated for mobile broadband expansion.

A recent CTIA study found that mobile broadband expansion can work successfully with an investment of \$1 billion per year - that's less than one-quarter of the total Connect America Fund. Yet, I understand there are proposals under consideration that would seriously underfund mobile broadband deployment with up to 93 percent of available funds being directed to wireline broadband.

Right now, mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. First responders and law enforcement depend on wireless networks to quickly pinpoint the location of a victim or a crime; farmers use mobile broadband to track shipments and complete transactions without having to leave the fields; and businesses use it to stay connected to employees and customers.

Furthermore, the economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invest \$1 billion per year in mobile broadband over the next 10 years, 150,000 new American jobs could be created.

Inadequate investment in mobile broadband will cost our nation jobs and compromise the ability of first responders and law enforcement to act quickly when timing is critical. If the Connect America Fund does not appropriately account for wireless, the safety and prosperity of our rural citizens will be diminished.

Rural citizens pay into the Universal Service Fund and deserve to see the benefits of mobile broadband investment. Utilizing \$1 billion out of a \$4.5 billion fund for wireless broadband is not too much to ask.

I urge you to ensure that reform of the Universal Service Fund includes a fair share for mobile wireless broadband networks. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Dee Taylor
304-290-3679

Deborah Sowers
1319 Pisgah Rd
Bruceeton Mills, WV 26525-5523

October 11, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned that an upcoming decision by the FCC to reform the Universal Service Fund to provide improved access to broadband in rural America may not do enough to promote the deployment of mobile wireless broadband Internet. All Americans need dependable access to broadband, both wired and wireless, to compete in this fast-changing world. But we need to make sure this reform is done right. There needs to be a fair share of funding allocated for mobile broadband expansion.

A recent CTIA study found that mobile broadband expansion can work successfully with an investment of \$1 billion per year - that's less than one-quarter of the total Connect America Fund. Yet, I understand there are proposals under consideration that would seriously underfund mobile broadband deployment with up to 93 percent of available funds being directed to wireline broadband.

Mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing and sharing information. First responders and law enforcement depend on wireless networks to quickly pinpoint the location of a victim or a crime. Entrepreneurs use mobile broadband to track shipments and complete transactions from remote locations. Businesses use it to stay connected to employees and customers.

Just as importantly, individuals - especially those "off the beaten track" - use it to stay in touch with the world.

Living in a rural part of Preston County, I have utilized wireless broadband more than once when we had power outages and/or impassable roadways due to weather.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invest \$1 billion per year in mobile broadband over the next 10 years, 150,000 new American jobs could be created.

Inadequate investment in mobile broadband will cost our nation jobs and compromise the ability of first responders and law enforcement to act quickly when timing is critical. If the Connect America Fund does not appropriately account for wireless, the safety and prosperity of our rural citizens will be diminished.

Rural citizens pay into the Universal Service Fund and deserve to see the benefits of mobile broadband investment. Utilizing \$1 billion out of a \$4.5 billion fund for wireless broadband is not too much to ask.

I urge you to ensure that reform of the Universal Service Fund includes a fair share for mobile wireless broadband networks. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,
Deborah Sowers
304 365 5000

Kay Flanagan
5257 Dry Fork Road
Hendricks, WV 26271-8011

October 4, 2011

Dear Public Comment Manager:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Kay F. Flanagan
304-478-2150

tracye murphy
515 isner creek road
elkins, WV 26241-8595

September 30, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Tracye Murphy
[7328909458](tel:7328909458)

David Currance
5237 Dry Fork Road
Hendricks, WV 26271-8011

October 1, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

David B. Currance
304-478-4680

hallie coger
p.o. box 2431
Elkins, WV 26241-2431

October 1, 2011

Dear chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Hallie Coger
304 637 0702

Jeremy Foster
3898 Mountain Lake Road
Hedgesville, WV 25427-7147

September 29, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Foster
[\(304\)-754-8177](tel:(304)754-8177)

Joyce Booth
82 Turkey Run RD.
Buckhannon, WV 26201-8411

September 30, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Joyce Booth
304-472-4768

nancy harless
po box 253
sumerco, WV 25567-0253

September 29, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Nancy Harless
3045247413

Mary Jane Ferrell
Rt. 1 Box 211-A
Middlebourne, WV 26149-9741

September 28, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Mary Jane Ferrell
3047717172

Charles L. & Margaret A. Lewey
RR 3 Bx 192-C
Wheeling, WV 26003-9419

September 28, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Charles L. & Margaret A. Lewey
304-905-8767

Michael Ryan
RR3 Box 55
Salem, WV 26426-9207

September 26, 2011

Dear Public Comment Manager:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Michael L. Ryan
304-782-1489

mr buford meadows
rt2 box 300d
belington, WV 26250-9568

September 24, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

buford meadows
304 823 3725

bob mcclung
69 buttermilk rd
ireland, WV 26376-9344

September 24, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

bob mcclung
3046127311

Linda Gorbey
1320 Hagans Rd
Core, WV 26541-6960

September 24, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Linda Gorbey
3042782154

Robert Miller
RT81 house6002 Kelly creek road
Mammoth, WV 25132-6002

September 22, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Robert Miller
304 5957189

Sharon Tenney
HC 61 BOX 87C
MABIE, WV 26278-9715

September 22, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Sharon Tenney
304-338-3346

Theresa Devine
402 jacquelyn drive
elkins, WV 26241-9546

September 20, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Theresa Devine
3046376811

Amy Good
HC 80 Box 16B
Kenna, WV 25248-9406

September 20, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Amy Good
304-5415743

Carol Nichols
#9 Jarrett Street
Elkview, WV 25071-9217

September 20, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Carol Nichols
304-553-9795

Barbara Strahin
RR 1 Box 63
Beverly, WV 26253-9723

September 20, 2011

Dear chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Barbara Strahin
3045914731

Richard Strahin
Rt 1 Box 63
Beverly, WV 26253-9723

September 19, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

Richard Strahin
3045914731

April Thurman
128 Miller Drive Apartment H
Ripley, WV 25271-1128

September 19, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

In addition, to invest this amount of money in technology that will shortly become outdated is like throwing it away; how does this make any sense? The only one it could make sense to is a company that stands to make money quickly while they still can because they are definitely aware that their opportunities in landline services are ultimately going to be phased out and replaced by mobile broadband. So why not invest this in technology that will only continue to grow and expand and most importantly create stable jobs within our economy.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,

April Thurman
304.549.0525

Betty Hill
101 13th. Street
Elkins, WV 26241-3483

September 19, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

Sincerely,
Betty L. Hill

bertie coiner
219 pinetree lane
clendenin, WV 25045-5616

September 18, 2011

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I am concerned about a proposal under consideration by the FCC that would severely limit mobile wireless broadband expansion in rural communities in favor of outdated landline technology. While it is critical to provide broadband service to more Americans, we cannot afford to waste scarce resources on yesterday's technology.

As I understand it, \$42 billion of universal service support would be used for landline broadband, leaving just \$3 billion to invest in mobile broadband over the next 10 years. That's \$14 spent on landline networks for every dollar invested in mobile broadband networks. At a time when our President and FCC Chairman have repeatedly spoken about how important it is for rural Americans to have access to high-quality mobile broadband networks, this allocation of resources is unacceptable.

Making matters worse, the proposal would allow the landline companies to pick and choose rural areas they want to serve with wired broadband, and those areas would not be eligible for funding for mobile broadband. Landline companies should not be able to choose what broadband technology is made available to rural consumers. That decision should be made by consumers.

Right now mobile broadband is the fastest growing way of accessing the Internet. If you consider where we could be 10 years from now, why would our government propose to spend \$42 billion building fixed wires in rural America? These funds could instead be used to build mobile broadband that would deliver more services, to more places, and be of more use, to more people.

The economic impact of mobile broadband is astounding. A recent report by Deloitte projects the creation of 15,000 jobs for every \$1 billion invested in mobile broadband. If we invested the same \$42 billion in new wireless broadband networks, 630,000 new American jobs would be created. Rural businesses need to have mobile wireless access to compete in this global economy.

Furthermore, emergency responders depend on wireless broadband networks to pinpoint and rescue victims in emergencies. Every time one mobile broadband site is built, our nation's Emergency Response Network is strengthened.

I urge you to prioritize mobile wireless broadband over outdated landline technology in any reform of the Universal Service Fund. Rural America simply cannot afford to be left behind.

bertie coiner
304 5487920